

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/517,824	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MASCHEK, HUBERTUS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jordan M. Schwartz	<b>Art Unit</b> 2873	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jordan M. Schwartz.

(2) Ali Imam.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 7 January 2008
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

50-51, 67-70

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With reference to independent claims 50 and 70, the last line of each of these claims, the limitation "beside the lens" created a lack of clarity since two lenses have been previously claimed. From the original claims and the specification as originally filed, it is apparent that this is referring to the lens "used for focusing the emitted light" and therefore the changes to these claims, as set forth in the examiner's amendment, were agreed upon to provide additional clarity. It was also agreed to cancel the non-elected claims 51 and 67-69. It was further agreed to add title headings to the specification as per the examiner's amendment.